

1 MELINDA HAAG (CABN 132612)
United States Attorney

2 MIRANDA KANE (CABN 150630)
3 Chief, Criminal Division

4 J. MARK KANG (NYBN 4033999)
Special Assistant United States Attorney

5 450 Golden Gate Avenue, Box 36055
6 San Francisco, California 94102
7 Telephone: (415) 436-7050
Facsimile: (415) 436-7234
8 E-Mail: Mark.Kang@usdoj.gov

9 Attorneys for the United States of America

10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
11 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
12 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION
13

14 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)
15 Plaintiff,)
16 v.)
17 ARTURO BARRAGAN GONZALEZ,)
a/k/a Arturo Barragan,)
18 Defendant.)
19

No. CR12-0627 WHA

**STIPULATION AND ~~PROPOSED~~
ORDER EXCLUDING TIME UNDER 18
U.S.C. § 3161**

20 On October 9, 2012, the parties in this case appeared before the Court. At that time, the
21 Court set the matter to October 23, 2012. The parties have agreed to exclude the period of time
22 between October 9, 2012 and October 23, 2012 from any time limits applicable under 18 U.S.C.
23 § 3161. The parties represented that granting the exclusion would allow the reasonable time
24 necessary for effective preparation of counsel. *See* 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv). The parties
25 also agree that the ends of justice served by granting such an exclusion of time outweigh the best
26 interests of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A).

27 ///

28 ///

STIPULATION & ~~PROPOSED~~ ORDER EXCLUDING TIME
CR12-0627 WHA

1 At the hearing, the court made findings consistent with this agreement.

2 SO STIPULATED:

3
4 MELINDA HAAG
United States Attorney

5
6 DATED: October 23, 2012

_____/s/_____
7 J. MARK KANG
Special Assistant United States Attorney

8
9 DATED: October 23, 2012.

_____/s/_____
10 JODI LINKER
Attorney for ARTURO BARRAGAN GONZALEZ

~~PROPOSED~~ ORDER

For the reasons stated above and at the October 9, 2012 hearing, the court finds that the exclusion from the time limits applicable under 18 U.S.C. § 3161 of the period from October 9, 2012 and October 23, 2012 is warranted and that the ends of justice served by the continuance outweigh the best interests of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. 18 U.S.C. §3161(h)(7)(A). Denying the requested exclusion of time would deprive the parties of the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. 18 U.S.C. §3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: October 23, 2012.



THE HONORABLE WILLIAM H. ALSUP
United States District Court Judge